Examiner, The

The *Examiner,* a paper sponsored by the government, was first published in August 1710. In this paper, Swift adopted the role of an anonymous and objective, yet critical, observer without party affiliation who believed honestly in the virtues of TORY rule. His first essay appeared in the paper in the first week of November 1710, and 33 weekly articles ran during the Tory Parliament's opening session until June 1711, when Swift was asked to conclude the series. Swift provided a running commentary on events in these fervently partisan political essays, which portrayed the WHIGS as mad for war and corrupt. These essays anticipated our contemporary op-ed pages of newspapers and the numerous cable news shows where the anchor meditates for a few minutes and delivers a modest opinion—though surely our modern examples of political commentary pale before Swift's.

Printed as a single 2,000-word essay on a folio half-sheet, the *Examiner* was influential in shaping public opinion toward the Robert HARLEY administration. It also became the vehicle for Swift establishing himself among numerous journalists, dramatists, and poets as a political writer with an unmistakably potent and attractive prose style. His audience would be the core Tory supporters: rural clergymen and country squires—the bedrock of English society.

His themes in each essay remained constant throughout: concern over increasing economic risk, extended credit, and godless capitalism. The Established Church and the constitution served as the twin pillars of his moral force, and often Swift easily achieved a moral victory against his critics. In becoming a widely popular columnist throughout Great Britain and Ireland, Swift realized the necessity to examine those great Whig figures, John

MARLBOROUGH, Thomas WHARTON, and Lord SOMERS, and found them avaricious, self-serving, and subversive.

Though Daniel DEFOE also wrote for Harley, his assignment differed in that his audience consisted of merchants and those who worked in connection with the various trades. The writers Joseph ADDISON and Richard STEELE in their periodicals—the *Tatler* and the *Spectator*—had in mind "to expose the false arts of life, to pull off the disguises of cunning." Swift certainly opposed vanity and affectation whenever he noted them in the characters he held up to public scrutiny, but Addison and Steele hoped to divert and amuse while providing their readers with a healthy dose of culture and learning. Swift's observer (or "Examiner") turned his attention to a government in need of nurturing and a political agenda requiring explanation and increasing levels of support and encouragement.

SYNOPSIS

Number 13: Thursday, November 2, 1710

[This paper first appeared as number 14, but most later editions of the *Examiner* follow John BARBER in omitting the original number 13, which was Francis ATTERBURY's defense of hereditary right (Ellis, *Swift vs. Mainwaring* lxx).] The writer begins by asserting that he has always made a habit of conversing freely with "deserving Men of both Parties." Because of recent events, however, he has had to change this practice. Specifically, many of his acquaintances in the "declining" Whig party have become unforgivably "peevish" and pessimistic, and he has decided to avoid them. In this paper, he intends to show that these Whigs' fears for the future are groundless and that all of the kingdom's problems are the result of "the very Counsels they so much admire." He also plans to argue that Queen ANNE's dismissal of Whig ministers was necessary to preserve the constitution.

Complaints against the queen's "late Revolutions at Court" include the charges that they were poorly timed (due to the ongoing War of the Spanish Succession) and were directed at affecting "the Settlement of the Crown, and call[ing] over the *PRETENDER*." These and other charges have been "plentifully scattered abroad, by the Malice of a ruined Party, to render the QUEEN and her Administration odious, and to inflame the Nation." It is truly a shame that continuing the war has become a means of profit for so many government officials, and if things continue it is likely that "a Landed Man will be little better than a Farmer at a rack Rent, to the Army, and to the publick Funds."

This desperate situation originated when "an under Sett of Men" convinced King WILLIAM that the principles of the Anglican Church were "inconsistent with the *Revolution*." Widespread "caressing" of the Dissenters followed, along with the disenfranchisement of universities and clergymen. At the same time, the costs of the ongoing war led the government to borrow large sums of money at "exorbitant Interest," and now the kingdom's wealth depends on rising and falling stocks rather than on the value of its land. The writer asks whether it is wise for a king to continue a war whose costs "perpetually exceed" what he is able to collect in the form of taxes from his subjects. What makes it even worse is that neither England's enemies nor her allies have placed themselves under such a burden, and will much more easily "recover themselves" after the war is over. Based on all of these factors, "it was the most prudent Course imaginable" for Queen Anne to enact "the Disposition of the people" by making sweeping changes in her ministry and in Parliament—freeing herself from the influence of those whose only interest lay in "perpetuating the War" for personal gains.

Number 14: Thursday, November 9, 1710

In response to "the Importunity" of his friends, the writer in this paper discusses "the Art of *Political Lying*." Although the devil is undeniably the father of lies, his reputation (like that of all inventors) has diminished in light of "all the Improvements that have been made" on the lie as he originated it. Historically, lying has been associated with fallen political parties. Modern politicians, however, have turned it into a means of obtaining (and retaining) power and as a tool for taking revenge after that power is lost. Political lies, moreover, are slightly different from others: They are often the brainchild of a fallen politician, and are usually "delivered to

be nursed and dandled by the *Rabble.*" A lie is a type of monster that dies immediately after birth if it happens to be born without a sting. Lies can (among other things) overthrow kingdoms, offer and remove employments, make atheists into saints, and raise or ruin a nation's credit. If someone in London possessed the ability to see lies (just as the Scots can see ghosts), that individual would be much entertained by the varied hordes of lies buzzing around the city.

Unlike everyday liars, those of the political variety must have very short memories. This is vital because of the constant need to contradict oneself and "swear both Sides of a Contradiction." The earl of WHARTON has been remarkably successful because of his skill in this area, and his fame is based only on maintaining "an inexhaustible Fund of *Political Lyes.*" He never concerns himself with the truth or falsehood of any "proposition" but only with whether or not it is expedient under the present circumstances.

Based on the widespread willingness among politicians to lie (and on the public's complementary tendency to believe them), the old adage that "*Truth will at last prevail*" seems questionable. However, after the Whigs exploited England for 20 years and made it impossible for the English to distinguish friends from foes, the people finally came to their senses and intervened. This shows that Truth will eventually win out, even if it sometimes takes a while.

Number 15: Thursday, November 16, 1710

For many years, England has sorely needed a paper like the *Examiner.* The writer vows to produce the periodical "without entering into the Violences of either Party." Because persons and events are so widely misrepresented, the public needs some "impartial Hand" to set their opinions right. England, the writer reminds his readers, is a limited monarchy. However, the English are unfortunately divided into two parties and face manifold enemies in religion and government. Two fanatical "stupid illiterate Scribblers" have undertaken to direct English sentiments regarding these threats in a pair of rival papers: "the *Review* and *Observator.*" While the majority of the population lacks the means to talk and think on their own, it is sad that they must be led by such rags as these.

The writer claims that his goal is to show the "remote and unstructured Part of the Nation" that they have been led astray by wild extremists "on both Sides." He has heard that a recent *Observator* was filled with specific refutations of his statements in an earlier *Examiner.* He refuses to engage in this popular tactic, having decided that the author is not worthy of his concern. The greatest problem with this sort of propaganda is that it "inflames small Quarrels by a thousand Stories," deepening divisions among those of different parties and preventing those who disagree about an issue from ever understanding one another. In fact, the terms *Tory* and *Whig* simply do not mean much anymore and have been utterly transformed in recent years to mean the opposite of what they once denoted.

In an attempt to dismiss some of the more popular falsehoods scattered by alarmist "idiots" in the press, the writer examines two of their favorite "maxims." The first is that the church is in danger. This may be true, but "the Church and State may be both in Danger" at any time during any monarch's reign no matter how skilled any particular ruler may be. The second false maxim is that England stands to suffer from the Tories owing much of their greatness to "the young *Pretender* in *France.*" The writer cites this claim as evidence that the rabble-rousing "scribblers" have made a habit of ascribing all causes to the Pretender (James Francis Edward STUART), whether a secretary resigns or the queen dismisses a Parliament. In this regard, they have become like the boy who cried wolf, having cried out against the Pretender so often that no one is listening anymore. The threat of the Pretender is contrived, since an act of Parliament has made it plain that "her present Majesty is Heir to the Survivor of the late King and Queen her Sister."

Number 16: Thursday, November 23, 1710

The writer recalls that in an earlier paper (number 13), he mentioned that "one specious Objection" to Queen Anne's recent change of ministry was that it had created "uneasiness" on the part of "a General, who hath been long successful abroad."

This general (John Churchill, first duke of MARLBOROUGH) has supposedly been treated with great ingratitude despite his remarkable service to queen and country. In reality, however, the only evidence of this ingratitude that the queen's detractors can produce is the fact that she "dissolved her Parliament" and significantly altered her ministry while Marlborough was abroad. These detractors further allege that it is not just the queen but the entire kingdom that is guilty of slighting Marlborough's service, since everyone participated in "*joining as one Man,* to wish" that the ministry be changed.

In fact, it is an embarrassment to the kingdom that the only thing that preserved the now-defunct ministry for so long was "a tender Regard" for Marlborough. It is also important to remember that even at the height of the controversy, nothing negative was ever stated or implied about "this great Commander." On the contrary, the entire citizenry "seemed Unanimous" in wanting him to remain in control of all "Confederate Forces."

There are, the writer argues, two types of ingratitude: one involves a monarch (or the public) repaying good with evil, while the other occurs when "good Services are not at all, or very meanly rewarded." Having already dispensed with the first in Marlborough's case, the writer now turns his attention to showing that the second type is equally inapplicable. The queen has handsomely rewarded Marlborough for his service to the kingdom. He has received valuable land and property, funds, and even pictures and jewels—all totaling "a good deal above half a Million" pounds, not even counting "what is *untold.*" The only reason for providing these details is to dismiss the comparisons some have drawn between the British and "the Greeks and Romans" who treated so many of their greatest generals with the utmost ingratitude. These figures (along with the table the writer provides to illustrate them) make it easy to see that the British at their worst are nowhere nearly as ungrateful as the "*Romans* were at *best.*" If the truth were known, most people who cry out against ingratitude would find that they themselves are indebted to those they accuse.

Number 17: Thursday, November 30, 1710

Having resolved that the *Examiner* would deal exclusively "with Things, and not with Persons," the writer has discovered that the topics he addresses are inseparably linked with specific individuals. Writing is like building—one's plans are often cast aside once the project gets under way, and the writer finds himself having to use whatever materials he can just to keep things moving. In public affairs, especially, when matters have been handled badly it is impossible to discuss them without unintentionally identifying and casting blame on those responsible.

One technique that satirists have often used to avoid naming names is to choose and discuss a historical figure "bearing a Resemblance to the Person" they have in mind. The problem with this approach, however, is that the audience too often fails to recognize the actual object of the satire. In an attempt to avoid this confusion, the writer perused the works of Livy and Tacitus to find useful characters to whom he could compare the modern politician he wishes to satirize (the earl of WHARTON). He ultimately decided that drawing any parallels would only damage the reputations of the Romans, so he determined to imitate Cicero and use extracts from his "harangues" against Caius Verres (a corrupt governor of Sicily). Accordingly, the writer includes what he calls a "faithfully translated and abstracted" oration Cicero delivered against Verres in the senate.

The speech begins with Cicero reminding senators of the widespread suspicion (in Rome and surrounding nations) that the wealthy can get away with crimes simply because of their wealth. In "condemning" Verres as a "Robber of the Publick Treasure" and an "Overturner of Law and Justice," the senate can send a powerful signal to the public that this suspicion is false. He follows with a litany of reasons in favor of holding Verres accountable for the crimes he has committed, arguing that while Verres governed the Sicilians were robbed of their rights to law and property: "I believe there is no Man who ever heard his Name, that cannot relate his Enormities."

In his comments after the extract, the writer laments that "modern Corruptions" cannot accurately be compared to ancient ones. There is no precedent, for instance, to which he can compare a man (undoubtedly Wharton, although he is still

unnamed) who manipulates the laws in order to excuse his own crimes.

Number 18: Thursday, December 7, 1710

The writer admits that he is often tempted to reveal his identity as author of the *Examiner* so people will stop criticizing the papers in his presence. The criticism he finds in rival papers does not bother him so much because when he tires of it, he can simply fold it up or cast it aside. It would be "happy," he adds, if he possessed the same "Power over People's Tongues." That way he would not have to listen as his work is "rallied at and commended fifty Times a Day."

He has further realized that he made an unfortunate choice when he chose to side with the Tories in his writings. What point is there (he asks) in defending worthy causes that the queen and Parliament have already embraced? He finds himself utterly at the mercy of printers nowadays, and wonders how much longer his paper will last. He promises, however, to continue writing the *Examiner* " 'till either the World or my self grow weary of it." All along, his goal has been to "undeceive those well-meaning People, who have been drawn unaware into a wrong Sense of Things"—many having fallen victim to wrongheaded politicians and "the foul Misrepresentations that were constantly made of all who durst differ from them in the smallest Article." An overwhelming number of these false representations came on the heels of the queen's recent decision to change her ministry: it is not enough, the writer laments, to point out that a wise monarch should be allowed the freedom "to change his Ministers without giving a Reason to his Subjects."

If his statements thus far have reflected badly on any individuals, the writer admits that it was impossible to avoid. It would truly be better, in fact, if for posterity's sake the names of those responsible for misleading the public were listed along with the deeds he has described. While a contemporary audience (by virtue of his hints and insinuations) can easily figure out whom he means to chastise, it will not be so easy for his and his readers' grandchildren.

Nonetheless, he will continue to capitalize on every opportunity to show "the misled Part of the People" just "how grosly they have been abused, and in what Particulars." Those who have spoken out most vocally against his paper never miss a chance to criticize the queen's decision to alter her ministry, but they ignore the fact that every branch of the government had become so corrupt that this was the only way to save the kingdom from ruin. Why else would the queen have taken so drastic a step? Based on all the negative backlash, it is remarkable that any of the new ministers agreed to step in. Their willingness to do so can be attributed only to their love for England and their strength of character. Sadly, they can expect nothing less than "the utmost Efforts of Malice from a Set of enraged domestick Adversaries" who are determined to cross them at every turn. In the end, however, the truth is plain: The queen made her intentions clear, the two houses of Parliament unanimously agreed with her, and the revolution in her ministry was absolutely necessary.

Number 19: Thursday, December 14, 1710

When the printer recently came by to pick up his copy of the latest *Examiner* manuscript, he dropped off several papers that had been "swinged off the *Examiner.*" Having read these for the first time, the writer finds himself convinced that "the Prejudice of Parties" best explains the current and pervasive lack of taste among the English. Neither party is entirely blameless in this regard, but Whig writers (in their responses to the *Examiner*) provide a particularly accurate portrayal of their party's "weak" and "ruined" condition. If "these People will not be quiet," the writer promises, he will be forced to begin answering his own papers—a tactic of which he has already been accused. Even supporters of the *Examiner* are causing him grief: while some complain that he has failed to deliver on his promise "to discover the Corruptions" of the now-defunct Whig ministry, others curse him for "discovering so many." Unable to please both sides, he has determined simply to proceed with his design, which in this paper is to outline some of the Whigs' tactics that "were no Hindrance to the [recent] Change of the ministry."

Their first practice was to introduce "new Phrases into the Court Style" of speaking, each of

which threatened desertion unless certain conditions were met. Statements such as, *"Madam, I cannot serve you while such a One is in Employment"* became commonplace in their parlance. Another practice was their ongoing attempt to remove "the Obligation upon Fellows of Colleges in both Universities to enter upon Holy Orders." This strategy was designed to prevent students from being misled by clergymen, who (supposedly) "infused into their Pupils too great a Regard for the Church and the Monarchy." The Whigs also sought "to impeach" Lady Abigail MASHAM for nothing other than her "faithful and diligent Service to the Queen" and the favor she enjoyed because of it. Finally, when they were in power the Whigs placed a "cruel Tyranny" upon conscience in England. At every turn they absolutely refused to exercise "the least *Toleration* or *Indulgence*" in politics, and in their rigidity excluded 90 percent of the kingdom from "the Pale of their [political] Church."

The writer ends this paper with a story "from an old History of *Sarmatia*" about "a great King in *Scythia,*" whose prime minister allowed a lord to build forts against an outside enemy, the *"Tartars."* The lord almost immediately began to "insist upon Terms" and threatened to unite with the Tartars against the king. Upon learning of this, the king's prime minister feared for his life and successfully urged the king to marry one of the lord's daughters. Afterward, the prime minister prided himself on having authored "a most glorious Union"—even though it was necessary only because of his own "Corruption." The writer explains that he has included this anecdote in order to confuse the "little smattering Remarkers" who so readily answer each of his papers, and to challenge them to find "an Application."

Number 20: Thursday, December 21, 1710

Admitting that he is "at a loss how to proceed," the writer indicates that a recent occurrence has prompted him to write on the subject "of *Soldiers* and the *Army.*" Despite numerous changes over the years in how wars are fought, there are several maxims (or "eternal Truths") that still apply. The armies of ancient Greece and Rome fought to defend their own interests, and never expected to be paid for their efforts. In modern Europe, however, the use of mercenary troops has become commonplace. These soldiers are nothing more than armed servants, hired "either to awe the *Children* at home; or else to defend from Invaders, the Family who are otherwise employed."

The practice of turning soldiers into paid tradesmen developed because of two factors. The first was usurpation, when "popular Men" robbed their peers of liberties "and seized power into their own Hands." In order to maintain their ill-gotten sovereignty, these usurpers had to hire "Guards" to keep the people under control. The other factor that popularized these "Mercenary Armies" was that large kingdoms frequently found themselves subduing distant "Provinces," and were compelled to hire soldiers to prevent rebellion on the natives' part. In a "free state" (including a monarchy), therefore, these hired armies are needed only for maintaining "Conquests" or for waging war in distant lands.

Since the latter case applies to England's current situation, it is important to recognize "certain maxims" that have always been observed by "wise Governments" engaged in military conflicts far from home. The first is that "no *private* Man" should ever be granted a commission making him a *"General for Life."* If any monarch is so foolish as to grant such a commission, he should go ahead and hand over his crown along with it. Requests for this type of appointment must be powerfully discouraged, and those who dare to make them should be put on record as criminals against the state. A second maxim that free states should observe when making war is that the military must remain separate from and subordinate to the civil power. The army, in other words, is a group of servants "hired by the Civil power to act as they are directed." As such, generals and their forces should be held in "absolute Subjection" to the government at home and must never be allowed to interfere with domestic affairs. Finally, armies are now more humane than they used to be, and it is vital for governments to encourage and preserve this civility in order to prevent soldiers from becoming "savages." One of the best ways to do so would be "to forbid that detestable Custom of *drinking to the Damnation or Confusion* of any Person whatsoever."

Number 21: Thursday, December 28, 1710

Those who revere England's constitution must be happy to witness its ongoing restoration, especially following the long period in which it was blatantly neglected. Having already outlined "some Abuses" during the previous ministry, the writer promises in this paper to "say something of the *Church.*"

Few in Europe have ever been so mistreated as the English clergy. The best arguments in favor of "*Revolution* against those many Invasions" of citizens' rights came from this group, who (unlike the Dissenters) refused to be swayed from the truth by attractive offers of preferment. The London clergy, moreover, provided "the best collection of arguments against *Popery* that ever appeared in the World." During the revolution (and even after JAMES II's coronation), a vocal minority took the clergy's call for reform to an extreme and promoted "a *thorow Reformation*" that would have destroyed both the church and the state. Ever since then, a "violent Humour" has run against English clergymen. They have been blamed for every sin committed by anyone in the realm. With their reputations ruined and unjustly assaulted from every side, the clergy finally found a friend in Queen Anne, who—acting as God's "Instrument"—turned the tide of public opinion in favor of these downtrodden churchmen. Not everyone, however, followed her lead. In particular, one group of men decided that English trade could never flourish until England became "a common Receptacle for all Nations, Religions, and languages." Such ridiculous politics have caused a number of problems, and were intended to turn worship (and God himself) into "a Creature of the State."

Ultimately the schemes of those malevolent men have failed. The queen wisely changed her ministry and quickly called for a convocation of the clergy. She also sent an important letter to the archbishop encouraging the Anglican clergy to rectify the "loose and prophane Principles" that had been promulgated among the public. The letter unfortunately caused a crisis in the convocation because the bishops and "lower clergy" communicated poorly about its contents. However, unlike other political troubles, such "Inconveniences" in the church cannot be cured simply by altering the ministry. Rather, "time and morality" are the only remedies, and it looks as though those factors are beginning to effect a positive change.

Number 22, Thursday, January 4, 1711

Entitled, "The *Examiner* Cross-examined: Or, A full Answer to the last *Examiner,*" this paper is written "in the true Style" of responses that had appeared following earlier issues of the *Examiner.* The writer assumes the voice of a despondent Whig, embittered by Queen Anne's recent change of ministry and by the *Examiner* itself, which he calls a batch of "insipid Papers." He promises to limit the first part of his discussion to some of the ludicrous claims made in the most recent *Examiner* (number 21).

The first of the many ridiculous assertions made in that paper was that "*The Queen began her Reign with a noble Benefaction to the Church.*" It is typical for High-Church Tories to think of the "church" as composed of priests who are "*hired* to teach *the Religion of the Magistrate,*" and obvious to everyone that the author of the *Examiner* wants the kingdom to be "*Priest-ridden*" once again. Even this, however, does not sum up the paper's argument because the *Examiner*'s writer is so "inconsistent:" One never knows "whether to call him a Whig, a Tory, a Protestant, or a Papist."

Convinced that he has provided "a *full, satisfactory Answer* to the *Examiner*'s last Paper," the writer states that he will now proceed to a more significant endeavor and prove that "the late Ministry" was (despite the *Examiner*'s claims) composed of "true friends to the Church." There are several pieces of evidence to support this truth. First, the apostle Paul himself had written that heresies in the church are necessary for the truth to "be made manifest" (1 Cor. 11:19). It follows then that "the more Heresies there are, the more *manifest* will the Truth be made," and the Whigs actually promoted the light of truth by "propagat[ing]" as many heresies as they did when they were in power. Second, the Whigs who were part of the late ministry showed how much they loved the church by taking "the Care of it intirely out of the Hands of *God*"—a "foreign jurisdiction"—and making it "their own *Creature*." Third, these ministers epitomized charity (the principal Christian virtue) by refusing to shut "*Dissenters*" out of the church. In fact, they were willing

to open the church to anyone and everyone, even to the point of razing its walls so no one would be left out. Fourth, the former ministry—"Pillars of the Church"—worked to "ease the Bishops from that grievous Trouble of *laying on Hands*." In doing so, they permitted everyone to exercise that power. This convenience avoided "*unchurching* those" who refused to believe that Anglican bishops had exclusive rights to the practice. Fifth, since truth is even more beautiful when compared with falsehood, the former ministry arranged for books to be printed which denied truths such as the existence of God, the divinity of the second and third Persons of the Trinity, and "the Immortality of the Soul." This fixed religion in everyone's mind and fueled a deep love for the clergy "among the Youth of our Nation." And finally, to make life easier on the clergy, leaders of the late ministry made it so that "*Convocations* should meet as seldom as possible" and never actually conduct any business when they met. This created all sorts of leisure time for the clergymen.

Having outlined ways in which the Whig ministry, in general, promoted the good of the church, the writer now promises to address "several Instances of particular Persons" who epitomized this party's love of that institution. The first individual (the earl of Wharton) was attacked in an earlier *Examiner*—number 17—under the name of *Verres*. This man "felt a pious Impulse" to donate funds to the church, but wondered about the best manner in which to do so. Finally he decided to sneak into the church, mount the altar, and void his bowels on top of it. He was, of course, arrested and fined £1,000, which provided the opportunity he had desired to support the church. Another lover of the church (William Cowper, targeted as "Will Bigamy" in *Examiner* number 17) discovered a way to help clergymen earn even more money from marriage fees. His ingenious "Invention" was to marry one wife and then marry another while the first was still alive. His convincing arguments for the legality of this strategy will, the writer hopes, soon appear in print and allow others to help the clergy in such a thoughtful way.

Number 23: Thursday, January 11, 1711

No one, regardless of their party affiliation, should have been offended by anything that was written about the army in an earlier *Examiner* paper (number 20). Some have argued that those comments were intended to highlight "certain abuses" by specific individuals associated with the army, and those suspicions are accurate. The writer insists that although he has not taken any of those objections seriously, he intends the present paper as a "Sort of Apology" for his comments in number 20. His intention in that earlier paper was not to impugn the entire army, but only "a few Persons" guilty of the abuses he described. It is important to remember that armies are as corruptible as other groups of men, and in an ideal world it would have been better just to keep silent about the abuses he saw. However, he was compelled to write about the problems he noticed because supporters of the former Whig ministry were taking every opportunity to praise the very men who were most guilty. This was an unforgivable affront to the queen herself and left the writer no choice but to tell the truth about corruption in the military.

Based upon the attacks leveled at him after his comments on the army were published, it is clear that the writer's Whig opponents operate under a double standard: "In *Them* it is humble and loyal" to offer their opinions on the queen, her Parliament and ministry. However, when others (like the author of the *Examiner*) "defend her Majesty and her Choice" to change the ministry, the Whigs call it insolence and cry foul. Nonetheless, recent events affirm that corruption in the military is not as pervasive as some have claimed, and "the Madness of a *Few*" should not be allowed to stain the honor of the entire army.

It is perfectly understandable that army officers were unhappy with the recent ministry change. While the old ministry supported continuing the war at all costs, the new sought to end it as quickly as possible. Peace is something no soldier—especially a successful one—really wants, and the writer does not blame the army for supporting the former Whig ministry. All that has been said about the "Valour and Experience" of the English troops is undeniably true, and it is not the army's fault that their successes on the battlefield abroad have not resulted in more noticeable benefits at home. However, members of both parties must admit that

things are better in England with the new ministry and the peace that has ensued. The queen is insightful and committed to the good of her subjects, and the army has achieved "perpetual success" in Flanders. How can these improvements be explained except by attributing them to the wise decisions made by the queen, herself, and the new ministry?

It is impossible to understand fully why the former ministry did not do more to end the war. The only reasonable explanation is that its constituents knew all along that the queen saw through their schemes, that the clergy, the "Landed Men," and even the general public had turned against them, and that the only way they could maintain their power was to increase their income by perpetuating the war. Had the queen not acted quickly, these malefactors would have "ruined the Constitution." While it was only natural for the army to want to prolong the war, the politicians in the former ministry clearly had ulterior motives for doing so. The writer ends by commenting that he has just received two pamphlets called *The Management of the War,* and he plans to examine them as soon as he has a chance.

Number 24: Thursday, January 18, 1711

It is human nature to maintain hope, even in the face of insurmountable odds. Men use hope for various purposes, one of which is to convince their enemies that they possess some hidden advantage. This has certainly been the case with the *"Ruined Party"* of the Whigs, who have nurtured all sorts of "pretended Hopes" as their power slipped away. They hoped, for example, that the queen would make no more changes to her ministry after removing the earl of SUNDERLAND, that no one would call for a "Dissolution of the Parliament," that they could ruin England's credit, and that the kingdom would suffer some catastrophe abroad. They even went so far as to hope that the widespread support for the queen's decision was simply a passing madness in the English people—one that would be cured once the populace realized how much it had been "deceived."

The writer promises to outline the causes and symptoms of this madness, and explain how it differs from their normal habits. Citing Machiavelli, he asserts that a people left on its own will usually act in its own best interests. Even when the citizens are deceived for a time, they will eventually recognize the deception and put things right. Recent events in England are proof of this, since the English suffered from a "long Madness" maintained "by a thousand Artifices." Once the constitution was decimated, however, they came to their senses "and peaceably restored the old Constitution." In truth, the recent wholesale changes in government resulted from the people's *recovery* from an *old* madness—not (as the Whigs argue) from their having fallen prey to a new one. The "County Elections" best measure the disposition of the people, and these showed that the overwhelming majority supported the queen's decisions.

Despite all of this, members of the ousted ministry continue to insist that the new regime "cannot possibly stand." It is important to recognize, however, that the only men who make this claim are those who fear being called to account for their past malfeasance, "those who keep Offices, from which others, better Qualified, were removed," and *"Stock-jobbers,"* who constantly spread such rumors to increase their own profits. It would be better if these individuals would simply be honest about hoping—rather than fearing—that the new ministry will fail.

When the ministry change occurred, many were worried that problems would follow, but the issues that did arise turned out to be fewer and less catastrophic than expected. Fortunately, when the Whigs were dominant the Tories never acted as the ousted Whigs do now. They never allowed resentment to get in the way of promoting the public good. In contrast, the fallen Whigs have become passive and stingy: what would have happened to England if the Tories had adopted the same strategy under the "late Administration?"

Number 25: Thursday, January 25, 1711

The writer recently heard some malcontents damn "the *Tories* to Hell" for claiming that if the ministry had not been changed, both church and monarchy would have been destroyed. Upon asking what had caused the Tories to say so, he found that the Whigs had asserted—with characteristic lunacy—

that the new ministry was bent on bringing in "*Popery, Arbitrary Power,* and the *Pretender.*" Instead of dwelling on what may have happened if the old ministry had remained, this paper will consider what would happen if the Whigs ever regained power. The "present free Parliament" would certainly be eliminated and replaced with one of a completely different character. At least a dozen votes would then be cast against the actions of the fallen Tory ministry and a bill revived that would once again sell English citizenship for a mere 12 pence.

In a hypothetical "Paper of Votes," the writer provides a broader picture of what a new Whig ministry would seek to accomplish. His conjectures are based on projects that certain individuals have actually undertaken or "projected." Among others, these include repealing the Test Act, opening civil and ecclesiastical offices to Dissenters of all types, putting someone besides the clergy in charge of educating children, forbidding priests from preaching about "Duties in Religion, especially Obedience to Princes," and giving a certain general a lifetime commission with the added convenience of making the war last as long as the general lives (see *Examiner* number 16). These and other measures would be the result of "the *Whigs* Resurrection." England would lose all hope of peace and be plunged into even more debt, bishops would lose their offices, and clergymen would be forced to depend on individuals for their support.

The writer now turns his attention to a "Gentleman" (William WOTTON) who had published a "Discourse" against an earlier *Examiner* paper that dealt with "the Convocation" of bishops (number 21). This "gentleman" claims that the *Examiner*'s representations are false and its *"Reflections unjust."* After dismissing each of Wotton's claims, the writer says that he will waste no more time on the subject, since the *Examiner* was never intended to manage controversies that were insignificant in the minds of most readers.

Number 26: Thursday, February 1, 1711

Writers who advocate lost causes enjoy a number of distinct advantages over those who support tenable ones. Among other luxuries, they can be content simply to "carp and cavil" at writers on the opposite side, they can dismiss or affirm whatever they wish with no limitations of "Truth or Probability, and they can get away with "a Pretence" of being truthful and disinterested, "for adhering to Friends in Distress." It is not that way at all for writers (like the author of the *Examiner*) who volunteer their services to the current "flourishing Ministry," which is dear to the people and respected by the queen, because they pursue the public good rather than any devious, self-serving schemes. The current ministry does not really need the help of sympathetic writers, and readers on their own side judge them as harshly as those who oppose them. The authors who work in support of the fallen ministry are responsible for uplifting "the sinking spirits of a whole Party." In contrast, all that those who write in support of the current ministry can hope for is to enlighten the ignorant, "and those at a Distance."

Having considered these points, the writer of the *Examiner* admits that he cannot be angry with those who write bitter replies to his papers. He rarely replies to these "answers," but it is not out of anger or "Affectation"—it is simply that once he states his facts and makes his case, he leaves it up to the world to decide the point. He laments the mistake some of these competing writers have made, however, in mistakenly identifying "a most ingenious Person as Author" of the *Examiner.* Out of concern for this gentleman's ease and reputation, the writer strictly assures these "angry People" that the individual they have accused "is *not* the Author."

If the real author has gained anything from all the responses to his paper, it is the hint that he should praise the current ministry in the same way that competing writers have so zealously lauded each member of the fallen one. These "judicious hirelings" (the writers) have praised "the whole Set of discarded Statesman" for possessing the very qualities that everyone—even their greatest devotees—said they lacked while they held public office. It is as though these erstwhile ministers cast their virtues aside upon "Employment," and have now taken them up again. The writer feels that it is his obligation to pay the same homage to the current ministry, whose members are far more deserving of the lavish praises falsely applied to their predecessors. What follows is a person-by-person encomium

of the current ministry, in which the writer tempers his praise by admitting that each of the current ministers possesses undeniable flaws. These supposed shortcomings, however, are all part of an effort to point out remarkable differences between the old and new ministries: for example, the new "*Lord Keeper*" is well known and eloquent, but "it must be granted" that unlike his predecessor he knows nothing of polygamy, he is not a "*Free-thinker* in Religion," and he has never supported any "Atheistical Book."

Number 27: Thursday, February 8, 1711

Avarice is undoubtedly the vice that humans take to the greatest extremes. When public officials engage in it, however, it is especially costly to everyone involved. In those cases, it initiates a chain reaction in which (for example) one incident of fraud leads to a series of others and the financial losses go far beyond the initial victim. The public ends up as the biggest loser in almost every case.

According to moralists, there are two general types of avarice. One involves wanting more wealth even though one is already well-supplied; the other is characterized by an "endless Desire of Hoarding." The first type is the "more dangerous in a State, because it mingles well with Ambition." When government officials such as prime ministers or generals indulge in this type of avarice, it can gravely impact the well-being of the public, and it is vital for someone to tell them truthfully what the world thinks of them and their greed. Constantly surrounding by admirers, these leaders are often more blind than an average citizen to their own shortcomings. The writer imagines that if he had lived in Rome at the time of the First Triumvirate (60 B.C.), he might have written anonymous letters to each of its members—Julius Caesar, Pompey, and Marcus Crassus—explaining what he saw as their most grievous vice and the dangers it posed for the state. He includes a letter to Crassus intended to help that very wealthy statesman recognize the extent of his remarkable greed.

The letter begins by praising Crassus for his grace and understanding, but quickly proceeds to tell him that he is not loved by any segment of the public (including his own army). The reason is that Crassus is "deeply stained with that odious and ignoble Vice of Covetousness." The writer explains that his goal is to convince Crassus that he is guilty, and that it will be up to the Roman to find and apply his own remedy. If there is any doubt about the truth of this accusation, the writer claims, all Crassus needs to do is disguise himself and go out among the common people. If—while in disguise—he initiates conversations with them and, for that matter, his peers, he will immediately find that everyone unanimously curses and censures him for his covetousness. When his enemies reflect upon Crassus's military victories, they attribute that success to the soldiers he commands rather than to him because even they recognize how much of a distraction his avarice has become. The good news, however, is that as soon as Crassus recognizes and turns away from this vice, he "will be a truly Great Man" (but still not a god, the writer adds).

Number 28: Thursday, February 15, 1711

In this paper, the writer responds to a letter sent to the *Examiner* six months earlier. It would have been better to have delivered the letter privately, especially since it demands an inordinate amount of work from the writer. The letter calls upon the *Examiner* to bring together "*some of those Indignities*" that the queen suffered in 1710. The writer has already compiled a number of these and planned to publish them all together in a large book or present them individually throughout future papers. He is concerned, however, that they will give the world a negative impression of England.

Despite this risk, the writer has decided to select a few "*choice Instances*" of these indignities and include them in upcoming issues of the *Examiner.* He will also draw upon an alphabetized file of all sorts of corruption and mismanagement on the part of the former ministry. It should really be no surprise that he has furnished himself so well, considering how many "*starved* Writers" he supports each week by giving them something to carp against in each of his papers. Regretfully, he has caused an epidemic of dullness and often wonders how so many competitors can pore over the *Examiner* each week, write against it, and yet make "so little Improvement."

He also wonders about the goals of these competing writers, but has decided that their primary objective must be to promote a better opinion of the fallen ministry or simply to prove him wrong. They seek to provoke him into engaging in an ongoing game of "Rejoinder and Reply," which would altogether eliminate his credibility. He had intended in this paper to examine Francis HARE's *Management of War* and *The Treaty of Peace,* and he could easily have shown the utter inaccuracy of both. He has decided, however, to take them up in a separate "discourse" rather than violate his rule of avoiding controversy in the *Examiner.*

Despite this goal, the writer finds himself in quite a dilemma, and would appreciate the letter-writer's advice on how to handle it. The problem is that while Whigs complain against the *Examiner* for being too harsh, the Tories rail against it for being too moderate. To illustrate, the writer includes "two peculiar Letters" he recently received. The first is from an angry Whig, who warns the writer that members of the fallen ministry still have many friends who will see his throat cut if he does not stop writing immediately. The Whigs' patience, he adds, "is now at an End," and having already lost their "Employments," they do not need him to turn the entire nation against their party. The second letter is from a disgruntled Tory, who claims to be dissatisfied with the *Examiner* because it obviously stops short of presenting all the author knows about the abuses and corruption of the "knaves" who made up the former ministry: "In short, turn the whole Mystery of Iniquity inside out, that every Body may have a View of it." He adds that the writer has simply been "too favourable" toward the Whigs.

Having carefully considered each of these letters and the extremes they represent, the writer has decided to proceed as he has in the past. He will continue to seek a happy medium between the two, even though he knows his paper would be more controversial—and therefore more popular—if he adopted one extreme or the other. He is also convinced that the Whigs' outcry of concern for the "late Ministry" and its reputation is a ruse designed to prevent those "Purloiners of the Publick cause" from being called forth and held accountable for their malfeasance.

Number 29: Thursday, February 22, 1711

The writer's only goal in producing the *Examiner* has always been to do good. He never suffered personally at the hands of the former ministry; it was simply that their politics ultimately contradicted England's constitution in ways that were impossible to ignore and reflected an utter disdain for religion. They were "justly suspected" of having anything but good intentions toward the kingdom, including its government and religion. A state faces grave danger when power-hungry politicians have to exercise their hatred for the constitution and the church in order to retain their power. They become far less selective in the individuals and standards they will allow into their party, and eventually embrace "some Principles from every Party" that is at all unhappy with the "Faith and Settlement" of the status quo.

Despite the mountains of evidence provided in the *Examiner,* some Whigs still contend that their leaders never had any designs against the constitution and that they would not have destroyed it had they remained in charge. The writer apologizes for having discovered their hidden agenda, but asks why anyone would have thought it was a secret based on the former ministry's obvious attempts to do just that. It may be that the ousted ministers and their supporters are denying the charge now in order to perpetuate the question of why "*the old Ministry*" was changed. In case this is their plan, the writer decides to answer this question with one irrefutable reason. Monarchs have always been blamed for the actions of the "minions" they empower, but England has had to suffer from the "avarice and insolence" of politicians who worked without the approval of the queen. Instead of earning her favor, they "snatch[ed] their own Dues" and treated her with disrespect—creating problems and then presenting them "as Arguments to keep themselves in Power." Considering how these disloyal courtiers joined in league against her, it is remarkable that the queen ever found the courage to dismiss them.

Initially, the queen surrounded herself with statesmen who supported the "old Constitution" wholeheartedly. Eventually, however, they became greedy and fostered divisions among her subjects.

The primary reason the queen had to make such drastic changes to her ministry was the "Insolence and Avarice" of these traitorous individuals. They made a "monstrous Alliance" with radical Whigs, who "profess Principles destructive" to England's "Religion and Government, and they left her no choice but to abdicate her own power or remove them from their offices. If this is not a sufficient explanation, doubters should simply "make an Abstract" of all the corruption detailed in other issues of the *Examiner.*

The writer recently heard patrons of a coffeehouse complaining about his letter to Crassus (in number 27), since it seemed to be directed toward a well-known individual who was still in office. It is difficult, he asserts, to understand why he should be censured for such a mild "reproof," since he simply intended to help that individual recognize (and cure) his avaricious behavior. No one should have ever expected him to reserve criticism for only those politicians who were no longer in power. Certain vices are often "more or less pernicious" depending on who exhibits them, and avarice is especially dangerous in a general. Crassus, himself, was the best evidence of this truth, since his greed alone caused his own downfall and that of his army.

Number 30: Thursday, March 1, 1711

The most unified societies are those collectively engaged in some evil endeavor and those "who labour under one common Misfortune." The reason these groups are so cohesive is that their members share a common goal. They are moved by a single spirit, and their individual interests do not impinge on those of their fellows. For a long time the Whigs fit the first critierion since "they have always been engaged in an *evil Design.*" Now that their leaders have been stripped of their offices, their unanimity is even greater than before.

Members of ruling parties, on the other hand, are not so united. Even when they are devoted to promoting the public good, too often there are disagreements among individuals about how that goal can be reached. Envy and impatience can come into play as the party flourishes, while certain individuals feel undervalued and disappointed by their party. "*Retrospections*" begin, dredging up "past Miscarriages," and the divisions that result are nurtured at every opportunity by members of the ousted party. They, of course, seek to divide and conquer the ruling faction by any means possible. Because of these tendencies, the writer says he regards it as his duty to "*warn* the Friends" and "expose the Enemies, of the Publick Weal," and to preach the virtues of unity every chance he gets.

There are two main causes of discontent among members of a ruling party. The first is an incredible urge to punish "the Corruptions of former Managers," while the second is an equally strong desire to "reward *Merit*" to everyone who had a hand in ousting the old party and bringing in the new. The writer promises to limit his present discussion to the latter. Merit, he explains, is the worth each man assigns to his own "Deservings from the Publick." There are so many false presumptions of merit, however, that the ancients might have produced an "agreeable Fiction" on the subject, complete with allegorical personifications of real merit, an unruly impostor, and others.

The writer decides to include an example of what this allegory may have looked like had the ancients written it. Entitled *A Poetical Genealogy and Description of Merit,* it indicates that Virtue and Honor had a son named Merit. There was also "a spurious child" born to Vanity and Impudence. This son was notoriously loud and obnoxious, while Merit spoke only in whispers (and "in Assemblies"). False Merit—"the Bastard Issue"—took every opportunity to stand in front of True Merit in public, and he was constantly speaking to courtiers and ministers of all kinds. False Merit's appetite, moreover, was insatiable: "the more you fed him, the more hungry and importunate he grew." People often confused him with the genuine Merit, and although he was born deformed, False Merit had "by Force of Art" gained a more desirable appearance. Only the wise were able to recognize him for the impostor he was.

Having ended his allegory, the writer assures his readers that they (and all their countrymen) are especially adept at distinguishing true merit from false, and that no monarch has ever had a ministry as skilled as the present one at making this distinction. This reflects well upon the queen, since she

freely chose the members of this ministry instead of having them forced upon her. Nonetheless, an "*unruly Faction*" continues to peddle contrived scandals in the press, and if one reads the papers it looks as though the Whigs are still in charge. The queen herself has even become a favorite target of libel.

In closing, the writer explains that he recently received a letter about a Mr. Greenshields—an Episcopal clergyman in Scotland—who had been charged with "reading Divine Service, after the Manner of the Church of *England.*" The *Examiner* author claims to be entirely ignorant of the matter, and calls upon the writer of the letter to pen a discourse devoted entirely to Greenshields's case. In the discourse, he should let the public know whether or not "the Episcopal Assemblies are freely allowed in *Scotland,*" especially since so many of their clergymen have "fled from thence." In any case, it is remarkable that the "*Whigs* and *Fanaticks*" in England are so focused on the "Sacred Act of Toleration" when their comrades nearby are so intolerant.

Number 31: Thursday, March 8, 1711

Last week someone sent the writer a passage from Plato's work along "with some Hints how to apply it" in an *Examiner* paper. The passage details a fable (by Aristophanes) on how humans originally had four arms and four legs until Jupiter—upset with the entire population—split them in halves. This was how love originated, since the cleft halves spent the rest of their lives looking for each other. Jupiter further threatened to split them once more, and the person who sent the passage claims that this has now happened: while the first separation created love, the second has created hatred by "prompting us to fly from our *other Side,* and dividing the same *Body* [politic, in this case] into two" parties.

The writer approves of the application with one adjustment. Parties, he claims, not only divide the nation, but each person within it—"leaving each but half" of their virtues and perspective. Members of a party can see only goodness in their group, only evil in the other. Party loyalties also cause each "brood of followers" to do foolish things in order to display their party loyalty: "*Whig* Ladies put on their Patches in a different Manner from the *Tories,*" and so forth.

With his "Metaphorical Genealogy" of Merit still in mind (see number 30), the writer has decided to provide a similar account of "*Faction*" in this paper. She was the youngest daughter of Liberty and at her birth, Juno (acting as midwife) "distorted" Faction at birth out of envy for Liberty. Like many parents who love their youngest and "disagreeablest" children best, Liberty doted on Faction to a fault. As Faction grew, she became such a virago that Jupiter ordered her to leave Heaven. Liberty gathered up all of her other children and moved to Earth, where the entire family was first thrown out of Greece because of Faction's evil deeds, then from Italy, and traveled all over Europe with the Goths. They eventually found themselves with nowhere to call home. Faction's "*great Employment*" was to "*breed Discord*" wherever she could (especially among families and friends), and at the same time to create "*monstrous Alliances*" between persons who had the least in common.

The writer notes that based on his understanding of faction, the name fits "those who set themselves up against the true Interest and Constitution of their Country." Members of the former ministry should keep this in mind, or at least explain why they continue to refer to the current ministry as a "faction." Listing the characteristics of a faction may help to clear up their confusion. Unlike the queen's present ministry, a faction has leaders who are usually upstarts or men of ruined fortunes. These leaders associate with "those who dislike the old Establishment," and the leaders themselves are full of new schemes in both government and religion. They have an "incurable Hatred against the old nobility," and (among other traits) their main objective is to amass "immense Riches at the Publick Expence." When one considers what a faction really is, the writer adds, it is easy to determine which party most deserves to be called one. The current ministry simply does not fit the definition. The Whigs are known for their tendency to "appeal to the People," but in actuality they do that only when they have confused and misled the people beforehand. In this case, the public should be allowed to decide which party is the true faction.

Number 32: Thursday, March 15, 1711

The writer explains that he has been distracted "from the general Subject" of his paper by news that Robert Harley had recently been stabbed by Antoine de GUISCARD (a "*French Papist*") on March 8. The assault took place while Guiscard was "under Examination for High Treason," being questioned by Harley, Henry Bolingbroke, and others. Although similar incidents have happened throughout history—Caesar's murder, for example, comes to mind—this occurrence is unique based on the aggravating circumstances surrounding it. Everyone knows that for centuries the French have been "too liberal of their Daggers upon the Persons of their greatest Men," but it is remarkable that a people best known for their "Vanity and Impertinence" would commit the sort of "Villainies" one would typically expect from Spaniards and Italians. Guiscard, himself, is just the type of criminal to engage in such a heinous act. He was guilty of "several Enormities in *France,*" particularly evil, and his *"Ill Look"* manifests the brooding, melancholy character he possesses.

If this stabbing had happened while the former Whig ministry was still in power, they would have ascribed it immediately to the group they call the 'faction' (the Tories), claimed it smacked of *"High-Church Principles,"* and indicted the entire clergy for orchestrating the entire thing. The current ministry, however, has avoided blaming the Whigs for Guiscard's efforts, even though it would be entirely "plausible" to do so. Nonetheless, it is impossible to miss how much the Whigs have in common with the "French Papists" in terms of wanting to end Harley's life. The former ministry sought to take it away through "Subornation" rather than through violence, but the goal was the same.

As far as the details of the assault go, Guiscard confessed in prison that his original target was Bolingbroke. When, however, Bolingbroke exchanged seats with Harley, Guiscard decided that rather than abort the attempt altogether it would be better to assault the man Bolingbroke most esteemed. For his part, Harley displayed remarkable poise after the stabbing. There was no change in his expression or in his speech, and he calmly asked the surgeon whether or not the wound looked to be mortal (since, if it did, he needed to attend to some business before he died). The writer claims that he is at a loss to understand why the *"High-flying Whigs"* have joined the "Friends of *France*" in seeking to destroy so great a man. In closing, the writer congratulates England on not having produced the "Savage Monster" Guiscard. He also suspects that the evil Frenchman had been scheming to assassinate the queen, herself, at the earliest opportunity.

Number 33: Thursday, March 22, 1711

Each apologia written by the early Church Fathers reflects its author's habits of defending truth, exposing falsehood, and accusing adversaries of nothing more than what could be proved. In recent times, however, these noble examples have not been closely followed. Ever since the Reformation, for example, the *"Papists"* have endeavored to cover up the "Absurdities" of their faith and to heap all sorts of accusations upon the reformers. It is no different in politics, since the Whigs have portrayed the Tories in distorted ways that stereotype them and promote Whig prejudices. In reality, there are no significant differences between modern-day Tories and the group known as *"Old Whigs."* The modern Whig party, however, is composed of such "a very odd Mixture of Mankind" that only the most radical individuals are consistent with its principles. This change occurred when the Whigs (in an effort to boost their numbers) began accepting "every Heterodox Professor either in Religion or Government." Once this happened, it did not take long for the party to completely lose touch with the majority of landowners, whose beliefs were more in line with traditional thinking. Throughout the party's transformation, the Whigs themselves pretended to support the church and the monarchy even as they did all they could to erode both. At the same time, they painted an exaggerated, negative picture of the Tories to prevent people from joining that party.

The charge against the Tories that has proved most useful for the Whigs involves passive obedience. Their distorted view of this principle has been widely accepted, and yet it is the most insupportable of their positions. When a Whig asks whether or not you support passive obedience, an

affirmative answer will lead him to accuse you of being "a *Jacobite,* a *Friend* of *France* and the *Pretender.*" Because the Whigs have presented such an inaccurate perspective on passive obedience, the public needs someone to explain its true characteristics. To do so, the writer will first present the false version espoused by the Whigs and then explain true passive obedience as the Tories understand it.

In the Whigs' view, passive obedience means believing that the king is answerable only to God. No matter what he does—even if it is against the law—the public has no right to question or resist him, since doing so "would be to resist God in the person of his Viceregent." One day God will hold the monarch accountable, but the subjects themselves can do nothing more than submit and obey. As "a thousand Papers and Pamphlets" illustrate, this is how the Whigs have described passive obedience. They have continually accused the Tories of supporting this ridiculous version of it, and especially those members of the queen's current ministry. They have also charged the clergy with preaching in favor of this brand of passive obedience.

Passive obedience as it is "professed and practised" by the Tories is quite different from what the Whigs have claimed. The Tories believe that every government possesses "a supream, absolute, unlimited Power," but they do not believe that a monarch should be obeyed when his commands run "directly contrary" to the laws of the kingdom. The crown is as liable to lawsuits as any private citizen, and a monarch's ministers can be prosecuted and impeached "although his own Person be Sacred." If a case should arise in which a king uses his power to support the "insolence" of corrupt ministers, citizens can justifiably "assert their own Rights" without violating "the Person or lawful Power of the Prince." In contrast to the caricature the Whigs have consistently peddled, this is how the vast majority of Tories view passive obedience.

Like all the "calumnies" hurled by the Whigs, this one is easily "wiped off." The Tories' objections against the Whigs have far more substance, and are "built upon their constant Practice for many Years." The writer himself has published numerous "instances" to back these objections, but the Whigs have failed to produce even one meaningful answer in the midst of all their carping. In last week's *Examiner* (number 32), the writer handled his subject so innocuously that he assumed he would escape their "merciless pens," but finds himself accused of "two Lies, and a Blunder" in his commentary on Guiscard's stabbing of Robert Harley. As usual, his opponents have focused their attention on minor details instead of responding to the serious charges he has leveled against them.

Number 34: Thursday, March 29, 1711

Having grown weary of his job as *Examiner,* the writer hopes the current ministry will grant him some honors and a pension. He is concerned that continuing to write the paper may one day "sowr" his temper. Some of what he has written about members of the former ministry has been called satire by "unthinking" readers, and this may be true as long as that faction is down. However, if they ever regain power, the writer says he expects to be recognized as a "*Favourite*" while those "pretended Advocates of theirs, will be Pilloried for *Libellers.*" The reason is that he has never charged that "Party, or its Leaders" with anything they would not immediately acknowledge and take pride in as soon as they recovered their positions.

For example, he has accused them of having been "Insolent to the QUEEN" and "against a Peace"—traits for which they have valued themselves all along. He also charged them with having plunged the nation into debt and "engrossed much of its Money." They have now gone even farther, and used up *all* of the kingdom's money and its credit, as well. He has written that they intended to bring about "great Alterations in Religion and Government," and if they obliterate both institutions "at their next Coming," he should receive honors for having foretold what would happen. He also claimed that they once had aspirations of taking Robert Harley's life. If they were currently in power, they would certainly cut off Harley's head and thank the *Examiner* for having justified "the Sincerity of their Intentions." Based on how much he has obviously helped their party, the writer intends to put in for an esteemed position as soon as the Whigs are restored.

All of this is perpetually confirmed by those who write in response to the *Examiner.* They constantly

accuse the writer of unwittingly betraying his own party and of writing with more bitterness "against those who hire" him than against the Whigs. The writer once thought that he was praising the Tories for their treatment of the queen, their devotion to the constitution and the church, and other noble attributes. Whig readers, however, regard all of this as satire because it goes against everything they believe characterizes a good ministry—it seems that the writer has been mistaken all along. From now on, then, he will write far more satire beginning with the remainder of this present paper.

Of all the advantages the kingdom has enjoyed since the great ministry change, the most notable has been the convening of the present Parliament and the "Dissolution of the last." The men currently serving in that body do so with honor and integrity, and keep the nation's best interests in mind with every decision. The House of Commons is especially noble, as evidenced by their "Bill of *Qualification,*" which stipulates that only landowners may serve in future Parliaments. The writer proposes a list "in some following Papers" of all the good this Parliament has already achieved. For the moment, he will mention "two Particulars" to illustrate "the Temper of the present Parliament." The first instance occurred after Antoine de Guiscard's "inhuman" attempt to murder Harley. Parliament passed an address to the queen condemning the act, praising Harley, and blaming his "misfortunes" on his remarkable "Zeal for her Majesty's service." The second action that clearly displayed Parliament's admirable character followed the death of the eldest son of William BROMLEY (Speaker of the House of Commons). The "Assembly" adjourned for a week so that Bromley would have time to grieve. In closing, the writer asks a favor of his readers: When they read papers written against the *Examiner,* they should not rely on the "mangled Quotation[s]" of the writer's words found in those papers. Instead, they should return to the original and read the entire paragraph in which the quoted passage appeared. If readers will do that, they will find "a sufficient Answer" to every objection these hostile writers make. The writer himself has read more than 50 of these competing papers and has yet to find one that quotes him accurately.

Number 35: Thursday, April 5, 1711

Having considered England's constitution, religion, and the demeanor of her people, the writer is contemplating whether the Whigs or the Tories will provide the "most security" for the queen and her government. If it were simply a matter of parties, it would certainly be best for the queen to avoid putting herself "at the Head of either." In this case, however, the Whigs cannot rightly be called a party because their constituency is so "heterogeneous," united only by a common goal of robbing and ruining the people. The Whigs are also characterized by their lack of "Veneration for *crowned Heads,*" by their opinion that the royal prerogative needs to be more strictly limited, and their preference for "a Commonwealth before a Monarchy." They also believe that no distinctions should be made among Protestants (which they take to describe everyone except Roman Catholics), and that a national religion is unnecessary. When individuals with these opinions are in power, they never treat monarchs with appropriate respect. Even worse, their "own Want of Duty to their Sovereign" leads them to crave power and to demand unreasonable submission from their peers. In some cases, nonetheless, there are circumstances that would lead a monarch "to deliver himself over" to a party like the Whigs.

The Tories are characterized by a completely different platform. They believe in "a well-regulated Monarchy," and they view anything that compromises that form of government as dangerous and deadly to the entire nation. In terms of their views on religion, it is simplest to say that they take "just the Reverse" of the position held by the Whigs. Another trait of the Tories explains why many monarchs in the past have elected not to employ them as public officials. When Whigs gain a little power, they immediately "grow into good Humour and good Language towards the Crown." They declare unending loyalty and praise the monarch at every turn. In contrast, the Tories ("in or out of Favour") never alter their loyalties to the current prince. Their behavior remains consistent no matter what. The writer encourages his readers to consider the distinctions he has drawn and to decide for themselves which party "a wise Prince" should look to for support and safety. Answering this ques-

tion will also help readers to decide whether or not the queen was "rash" in her decision to make wholesale changes in her ministry—a choice that has been praised so highly by some and condemned so heartily by others.

Number 36: April 12, 1711

This paper is written "for the sake of Dissenters," who (from the writer's perspective) are the fastest-growing group of Whigs who still profess to be Christians. He knows that everyone will understand that by "Dissenters," the writer means Presbyterians, and he provides a brief history of their rebellion against unsympathetic monarchs. Under JAMES II, the Presbyterians joined forces with the papists—supposedly their sworn enemies—in rebelling against the Crown. After the Glorious Revolution, the Dissenters found themselves "rewarded with an Indulgence by Law," and were treated favorably. However, once they "found all was desperate with their Protector King *James,*" they joined the newly formed Whig party which had set itself against "old Principles in Church and State."

The Presbyterians should carefully consider how different things are now than they were seven decades ago, when they first "begain their Designs against the Church and Monarchy." Back then, they were the largest part of the Whigs, and anyone who joined the party with ulterior motives was "forced to shelter under their Denomination." Now, however, the party is controlled by those who wish to level all religion or do away with it altogether. The Presbyterians would be foolish to assume that if the Whigs ever succeeded in destroying the Church of England, they would look to the Dissenters to rebuild it anew. As things currently stand, the best course for the Presbyterians would be to ally themselves with the Anglican Church.

They should also exercise some decency and distance themselves from the present-day Whigs, who are so blatantly opposed to England's Christian monarchy. While the Presbyterians fault the Church of England for having failed to divorce itself from "Popery," they have joined with "Papists and a Popish Prince to destroy her." And while they rail against the "wicked Lives" of certain Anglicans, they continue to scheme "with *Libertines* and *Atheists*" to ruin the state church. In short, the Dissenters have lost their status as leaders of the Whig party, and should immediately work toward securing a better relationship with the Crown and the state church.

There are three steps the Presbyterians should take to achieve this goal. First, they should take care not to provoke the vast majority that now stands against them. They should end their relationships with their radical allies, "disperse themselves, and lie dormant" until circumstances change. Second, although there are no laws (except God's) against occasional conformity, they should use it with the utmost care. Exercising it too frequently might lead the Crown to take some action against them. Finally, they should drop their act of being "under horrible Apprehensions" that the Tories are conniving to bring in the Pretender (James Francis Edward STUART). This pretension, learned from the Whig leaders, is based on the ridiculous notion that the Whigs are all that protect England from "*Popery* and *Arbitrary Power.*" The writer ends by asking that those who send him ideas for *Examiner* topics would think more carefully about what they suggest.

Number 37: Thursday, April 19, 1711

The writer observes that the Whigs have recently begun to change their language. They are saying that if the new Tory ministry continues as it has, they will have nothing left to complain about. This shows that the suspicions of those who supported the ousted Whigs were completely unfounded. Nonetheless, a number of the Tories' "Adversaries" continue to complain about the same old things. They allege, for example, that the queen was unwise to change her ministry during a time of war. This charge, like all the others, is patently false. It is impossible that an act of "Rashness or Chance" could have yielded all the "Harmony and Order" the kingdom has enjoyed since the ministry was changed. It was obvious to everyone but the Whigs that the queen had to do something: With the Whigs in charge, she had lost the power to nominate anyone for office on her own. The oligarchy (which had exercised more power than it rightfully should have) took offense when she reclaimed that power and appointed individuals without consult-

ing them. The writer insists that anyone who knows anything about politics must admit that a "Prince" who had been treated as badly as the queen has no choice but to "extricate himself as soon as possible."

The Whigs lay all the blame for their fall on the "haughty Pride, and unsatiable Covetousness" of the duchess of MARLBOROUGH, but the fact is that in changing her ministry the queen simply acted in a way that reflected the will of the people. The war was costing more than the kingdom could afford, and only the Whigs would blame her for instituting a more qualified ministry to help get England out of a conflict it could no longer sustain. In any case, both parties should judge the wisdom of any decision by its outcome, and clearly the crown's authority (which the Whigs had "scandalously Clipped and Mangled") has been effectively restored.

Another complaint the Whigs continue to make is that they are treated too harshly in publications such as the *Examiner.* It is bad enough, they claim, to have lost their political power: it is unfair and unnecessary to have their "Infirmities" displayed "in order to render them yet more odious to Mankind." This is a remarkable charge, since only in England could the Whigs get away with the all the libelous material they have published about the Tories. When the tables were turned (before the change of ministry), the Tories never stooped to the level of impertinence that characterizes the Whigs' publications. Oddly, the most vocal Whigs are out of step with the majority of their party who, "in disputing with [Tories], do generally give up several of the late Ministry; and freely own many of their Failings"—especially in terms of the massive debts they incurred, their insolence, and avarice.

Number 38: Thursday, April 26, 1711

The writer marvels at how much the "Dexterity of Mankind in Evil" surpasses the efforts of honest individuals and the laws of the kingdom. Those whose occupations involve the constant retail of fraud (such as attorneys) are especially ingenious in their efforts to circumvent the legal system. One reason that the laws cannot rein in such individuals may be that the aggressor in any situation always has an advantage over the defender. Another possible explanation is that men are rarely "rewarded by the Publick" for doing good, while successful fraud yields immediate benefits. When laws are made to curb the practices of dishonest citizens, there are always those who devise new and ingenious ways to continue doing what the law is supposed to prevent. They manage to still "reap the Advantage" of the fraud while narrowly avoiding the shame and danger that might accompany it.

This, the writer finds, is particularly true of "that dextrous Race of Men, sprung up soon after the Revolution." There is no way the writer can enumerate all the means these "curious Men" have discovered "to enrich themselves, by defrauding the Publick, in defiance of the Law." Their continued success illustrates the great defects in the laws of the kingdom—defects that are the result of "our best Possession, Liberty." The legal system is generally too lenient in its treatment of criminals, and an examination of numerous cases shows that "it is no wonder that the Injuries done to the Publick are so seldom addressed."

Politicians (like those in the "late Ministry") often break the laws in order to protect the power they possess, and to provide for their own safety in case that power is lost. The now-fallen Whig ministers did this through "two admirable Expedients." First they procured "a general Act of Indemnity, which cuts off all Impeachments," and then they found ways to make it look as though their self-serving decisions reflected the will of the public at large. A shining example of the second tactic was the Whigs' address to the queen (about three years ago) asserting that she should not "consent to a Peace" and end the war unless it involved making "entire Restitution" to Spain. It was obvious to everyone in England and abroad that this was simply an attempt to "pin down the War upon" the Tories, to increase the Whigs' own "Power and Wealth," and to "multiply Difficulties on the QUEEN and Kingdom."

All of this makes it clear that under the kingdom's current laws, "ill-designing Men" will continue to commit blatant crimes and yet escape any punishment from the legal system. It is simply incorrect to argue, then, that men are innocent "because the Law hath not pronounced them Guilty." Satire, the writer suspects, was invented to

help deal with this problem, since shame is the only likely means of stopping evildoers from doing what the laws cannot prevent. If there were any indications that Whig leaders felt any remorse for what they had done, the writer insists that he would gladly change his style and overlook "their Million of Enormities." Each day, however, they seem increasingly "fond of discovering their impotent Zeal and Malice," so he will continue in the *Examiner* to treat them as they deserve to be treated: as "Enemies to our Country and its Constitution."

Number 39: Thursday, May 3, 1711

For years, the Whigs and Tories have attacked one another based on a number of fairly consistent "Topicks of Reproach." The Tories, for example, allege that the Whigs seek to destroy the Established Church and the monarchy. The Whigs' charges against the Tories "may be summed up" with "three formidable Worlds, *Popery, Arbitrary Power,* and the *Pretender.*" A primary difference between the two groups, however, is that the Tories actually provide proof to support their charges against the Whigs. As far as the writer can tell, the Whigs have not bothered to find any real evidence to back their accusations.

Since the Whigs perpetually allude to popery, arbitrary power, and the Pretender (James Francis Edward Stuart) in their tirades against the Tories, the writer has "been considering" how well those terms might be employed against the Whigs themselves. As for popery, the Whigs have done far more than the Tories to pave the way for it in England. The Roman Catholic Church has supposedly worked to divide the English into as many factions as possible, and the Whigs have certainly helped in that effort. Their cry has long been that "no Man, for the Sake of a few *Notions* and *Ceremonies*" ought to lose the right to hold office.

Another constant accusation the Whigs level against the Tories is that they encourage and promote arbitrary power for England's monarchs. What they really mean, the writer argues, is "*Passive-Obedience* and *Non-Resistance*"—neither of which is equal to arbitrary power. In defending passive obedience, the writer notes that his writings represent nothing more than his own opinions. He does not claim to be the mouthpiece of any party. Since the Tories (unlike the Whigs) have no "dark Designs" to advance, they do not need any hired scribes to promote *"Heterodox Opinions."* The Whigs and the Dissenters are "exactly of the same political Faith," and both factions have done their part to promote the arbitrary power against which the Whigs clamor.

The Whigs have also insisted that the Tories are covertly working to bring in the Pretender. They have even argued that the queen herself is part of the scheme. Each time this charge comes up, the Whigs make it in a general way without ever pointing to any specific instances as evidence. In truth, if the Pretender ever does gain power in England, he will immediately find that "the Whigs are his Men." To this day, those who owe the most "Gratitude to King James" are also "the most zealous Whigs." Lately, the Whigs have even claimed that the Pretender is not an "impostor," but an actual prince "born of the late QUEEN'S [Mary II's] Body." It is very probable, in fact, that the Pretender's greatest hope lies "in the Friendship he expects from the *Dissenters* and *Whigs*." He chose to invade when the Whigs were dominant, and based on the "gracious Treatment they received from his supposed Father," it is easy to understand why he was counting on them. After all, the Whigs possess a "natural Faculty" of attracting and supporting pretenders ("to Wit, Honour, Nobility, [and] Politicks"), so it is no surprise that they would seek to put a *Pretender* on the throne.

Number 40: Thursday, May 10, 1711

On a recent visit to a coffeehouse, the writer perused a paper (*The Congratulatory Speech of William Bromley . . . to the Right Honourable Robert Harley*) and found it remarkably similar to the *Examiner.* Among other "propositions," the author asserts that even Harley's enemies recognize his greatness—as evidenced by their constant *"Endeavours against his Person and Reputation."* This statement clearly refers to something more than Guiscard's attempt to assassinate Harley, and it is probably intended to recall "the business" of William GREGG. It has given the writer great pleasure to see so many of his charges against the Whigs confirmed by certain resolutions of Parliament. The Whigs' mismanagement, for

example, caused the military defeats at *"Almanza"* and *"Toulon,"* and they "grievously" defrauded the public in various ways. Lately, however, the public seems more interested in rewarding those who saved the constitution than in punishing the Whigs who flouted it. There are two individuals, in particular, who have been "singled out, as designed very soon to receive the choicest Marks of the Royal Favour."

These circumstances have led the writer to consider the late ministry's many "Heresies in Politicks." The worst of all (and the most dangerous to England's monarchy) was their "Contempt for *Birth, Family,* and *ancient Nobility.*" While it is certainly possible to exaggerate the impact of one's lineage on character, no one can seriously deny that there is no relationship between the two. Those who are born into "what we call the better Families" simply enjoy more of the opportunities and benefits that help create great leaders. Some noble families have been known to neglect the education of their sons, but this is mainly due "to that *Whiggish* Practice of reviling the *Universities*" for supposedly "instilling *Pedantry,* narrow *Principles,* and *High-Church Doctrines.*" Thankfully, he adds, the two patriots mentioned earlier exemplify what happens when merit and virtue are combined "with ancient and honourable Birth." He is sad to recall that another shining "ornament" to true nobility (the earl of ROCHESTER) has recently died. This "late *Lord President*" distinguished himself in many ways as a public servant of the utmost character.

Number 41: Thursday, May 17, 1711

The writer insists that he is not partial, nor has he been hired to defend the present ministry against those who write against it. When he undertook the *Examiner,* he resolved to publicize "gross Neglect, Abuse or Corruption in the publick Management" whenever he saw it. He has closely scrutinized the actions of the current ministry, and the truth is that its members have simply done nothing worthy of censure.

There is one "small Occasion of Quarrelling," however, that he has discovered. That is the ministry's failure to put a stop to the "flaming Licentiousness of several Weekly Papers" that miss no opportunity to publish "Scurrilities against" the queen's closest officials. Specifically, he has the *Medley* in mind. The writer has simply ignored all the groundless rants that paper contains against him, but finds himself especially troubled by the *Medley* dated May 7 because it contains "two Paragraphs relating to the *Speaker* of the House of Commons, and to Mr. *Harley,*" and the writer regards it as his duty to comment on these statements. The affair began when the House of Commons resolved that the Speaker should congratulate Harley officially on his "Escape and Recovery" from Guiscard, who had attempted to murder him on March 8 (see *Examiner* number 32). After the congratulatory speech was published, the author of the *Medley* argued in print that the commendation *"was ill-chosen Flattery"* since Harley had caused *"great Difficulties"* for the nation. The *Medley*'s author further alleged that the speech was an exercise in hypocrisy since the Speaker "*is known to bear ill Will to Mr.* Harley."

The writer of the *Examiner* asks the Whigs themselves whether public officials in England have ever been treated with such blatant and public disrespect. Even worse, this is not some "clandestine Libel," but one that has been "openly Printed and Sold" with the printer's name clearly indicated. The laws are "very defective" in allowing this sort of defamation to go unpunished. If the current ministry will "endure such open Calumny, without calling the Author to Account," they almost deserve it. The ministry's habit of ignoring "little Things" like this will not always have "little Consequences."

When his paper was first established, the writer intended "to *examine*" some of those publications that reflected the authors' evil tendencies toward "Religion or Government." He was soon distracted by more pressing issues, such as explaining why the Whig ministry needed to be replaced in order to save the "Constitution in Church and State." If he continues to write the *Examiner,* he intends to spend more time "exposing and overturning" the arguments of those who write in favor of the Whigs, without concerning himself with the insults they hurl at him. There is clearly a need for this sort of paper on the Tory side since Abel BOYER, "a

little whiffling *Frenchman,*" continues to publish his Whiggish monthly called (with incredible inaccuracy) *The Political State of Great-Britain.*

Number 42: Thursday, May 24, 1711

The writer has received a number of letters lately regarding a plan to build 50 churches in London and Westminster. A convocation of the clergy encouraged the queen to adopt the plan, and the House of Commons is in the midst of drafting a bill to make it a reality. The clergy cannot help but be pleased at the "new Scene of publick Affairs," especially since the new Parliament consistently "takes the Necessities of the Church into Consideration." The English in recent years have appeared to be a much worse people than they really are, all because the Whigs have been in charge. When factions are overthrown in any society, the citizens always find their way back to "Reason and Religion."

By the writer's calculations, each of the 50 proposed churches will cost £6,000. This is less than "the Price of a Subject's Palace," and certainly worth the cost, considering that more than 200,000 souls will be cared for. For many years now, we have known that English parishes vary wildly in size, and the discrepancies are even worse now in London. Many districts contain far more parishioners than one minister (and all the church buildings) can possibly accommodate. This has made schism a "necessary Evil," and contributed to an overall "Neglect for Religion" worse than any the author has ever heard of.

Parliament, however, is already working on a solution to this problem in the form of "a Tax laid upon every House in a Parish, for the Support of their Pastor." The writer hopes that these wise lawmakers will refrain from setting the tax at any particular amount, and instead create a tax "in Proportion to the Rent of each House, although it be but a Twentieth or even a thirtieth part" (see "LETTER FROM A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS"). In line with Parliament, the queen herself has the best "Disposition" of any prince when it comes to advancing religion, but (to England's shame) the "long and ruinous War" has severely limited her efforts to pursue her designs. Were it not for the war, the queen's "Care of Religion" would have reached the "*American* Plantations" by now. Those colonies, inhabited by countless numbers of individuals from England, will remain a "perpetual Reproach" to the English until Christianity is promoted more intensely among them. At present, however, there are more than enough subjects at home in need of the gospel, and the writer hopes the clergy will seize every opportunity to improve the "pious Dispositions of the QUEEN and Kingdom, for the Advantage of the Church."

Number 43: Thursday, May 31, 1711

Forced by convention to use the words *Whig* and *Tory* for the past 20 years, the writer has decided to outline the changes in meaning those words have undergone. He will also explain what he takes each word to mean. These kinds of "appellations," he admits, are usually "invented by the Vulgar," who prefer to argue by calling names instead of discussing issues. The terms *Whig* and *Tory* seem to have originated late in CHARLES II's reign. They were dropped during the reign of JAMES II, and "revived at the Revolution." Since that time, they have been used "perpetually"—often to describe "very different kinds of Principles and Persons."

In December 1688 the names were used to distinguish one group from another at the Convention of Lords and Commons (those who favored granting a "Regency" to WILLIAM of Orange and those who believed he should receive the title and all the benefits reserved for the king). The distinctions between Whigs and Tories became even more complicated when the Dissenters began making distinctions between High- and Low-Church, alleging that High-Church supporters were united with the "Papists."

Despite the confusing ways in which these terms have been applied, the writer seeks to list some "principles" that served to distinguish Whigs and Tories prior to Queen Anne's accession. *Tory* was used to describe supporters of High-Church principles who opposed a "Standing Army in Time of Peace," and disagreed with the majority of bishops. The term was used to describe those of the majority opinion in the House of Commons, particularly members of the "Country-Party or Landed Interest." Whigs, on the other hand, were

Low-Church supporters who held that the royal prerogative was superior to the laws "for serving a Turn," and touted the "King's Supremacy beyond all Precedent." Casting any doubt whatsoever that "the pretended Prince" was "Suppositious," and of common lineage was (in the Whigs' view) "perfect Jacobitism." Taking grants away from royal favorites and using them to further the public good was also "the very Quintessence of *Toryism.*" The writer explains that by the time Queen Anne "came to the Crown," the Tories and Whigs had virtually exchanged their views. The Whigs, for example, had so vehemently "renounc'd" their former view of the Pretender that they seemed to be the greatest promoters of his legitimacy. It was not long after her accession that two *"great Persons"* (Marlborough and Godolphin) turned their backs on Tory principles and agreed to a "Treaty with the *Whigs*," who offered them more attractive terms.

Since then, the term *Whig* has come to be associated with a "certain Set of *Persons,*" rather than any specific principles. In the writer's view, the term now describes anyone who had faith in the former ministry. In the *Examiner,* he uses it to denote those who were "Partisans of the late men in Power," who knew of their schemes or who united with them out of hatred for the church and constitution of England. He also uses *Whig* to describe—among others—"Unbelievers and *Dissenters*" or "Men in Office" who feared change because of the gross corruption of which they were guilty. He does not include among Whigs those who were misled out of ignorance or "seduc'd" by crafty arguments into thinking more of the former ministry than it deserved.

Whig and *Tory* currently have almost no relation "to those Opinions, which were at first thought to distinguish them." Originally, Whigs were those who supported the Revolution, opposed the Pretender, and regarded England's government as a limited monarchy rather than an absolute one. In contrast, Tories were those who defended "the Queen's Hereditary Right," regarded "the Persons of Princes" as sacred, and their power never to be resisted. They also abhorred schism as "the Ruin of the *Church*" (and a serious hazard to the state) and insisted that power should never be given to those who were not "of the Establish'd Religion." In the writer's view, the clearest and most current definition of a Tory is one who—regardless of political pressures—will do whatever it takes "to save their Prince and Country, *whoever* be at the Helm."

Number 44: Thursday, June 7, 1711

Any "true Lover of his Country" who considers the shameful conduct of the former ministry—its dishonesty, its alarmist propaganda, the brutal character assaults it launched, and the like—cannot help but be pleased at how woefully unsuccessful its members' schemes have turned out to be. None of the "misfortunes" they predicted (and pretended to fear) ever materialized once the ministry was changed. Such a wholesale alteration was a "daring" move, and one that succeeded only because of the queen's wisdom and goodness and her ministry's capabilities. It also helped that the voice of the people clearly supported her decision to enact the change.

It was certainly no surprise that the naysayers raised such a "Noise" about the change being "dangerous and unseasonable," but present circumstances clarify that their fears were entirely groundless. When any house is swept, it is sure to raise some dust. As a matter of "Justice" to the current Parliament, the writer has decided to list several of that assembly's great accomplishments "for the Service of their QUEEN and Country." They saved the nation's credit by restoring the value of "Exchequer Bills." They also provided relief to "*Nevis* and St. *Christophers*"—British colonies that had long endured merciless plundering and destruction at the hands of the French. The Commons attempted to deal with the overwhelming number of "Foreigners of all Religions" that had flooded the kingdom since the former ministry's "Act of general Naturalization." Their attempt to repeal the act, however, was defeated in the House of Lords. Both houses enacted a "*Qualification*-Bill," which limited eligibility to serve in Parliament to those who possessed "some Estate in Land." This may be the single most important means ever devised for preserving the constitution of the kingdom. Parliament also tackled the nation's soaring

debt and established a security fund against that "immense" liability—an act that will probably "prove the greatest Restoration and Establishment of the Kingdom's Credit." In addition to the administration's clear "Concern for Religion" and its determination to engage in "a Trade to the *South-Sea,*" there are numerous other achievements that further illustrate its noble character. The writer admits, in fact, that he has probably forgotten some important examples of how ably "this great Assembly" has pursued the good of those who elected them.

As far as the writer is concerned, his goal in writing the *Examiner* has now become a reality: A "great majority" of the kingdom now agrees the queen acted wisely in "changing her Ministry and Parliament," and recognizes how remarkably corrupt the former ministry actually was. He learned long ago to ignore the "little barking Pens" that have hounded him ever since he undertook the paper, and their only accomplishment has been to make him ashamed to be one of their "species."

Number 45: Thursday, June 14, 1711

Convinced that "the main body of the *Whigs*" is now soundly defeated, the writer compares himself to a general who has defeated an army and subdued a kingdom. Now that the bulk of his work is done, he finds himself "at Leisure to *examine* inferior Abuses," and he has decided to pursue those who seek to perpetuate the war even though they have nothing left to fight for. Specifically, he now targets the pro-Whig writers who for so long have clamored against him without any retribution. In a mock petition, he promises to show that these hacks were "guided" by nothing other than a desire to "gratify a private Interest." The petition is written as though it were sent from "four Score" of the Whigs' writers and addressed to the present ministry. In it, the writers complain that since the *Examiner* may now cease to be written, they and their families are in danger of starving due to a lack of material. Having nothing original to say, they had come to rely on that paper as a source from which to quote inaccurately and as an object for other "legal Abuses." In the end, they request permission to continue as usual, even though they can produce nothing other than "the *same Stuff*" presented in exactly "the *same Manner*" as before.

COMMENTARY

Political patronage was a key element in Swift's decision to remain in London in 1710; he had come on behalf of the Irish bishops seeking financial relief from the Whig government and stayed in the city when the chief Tory ministers took notice of him and his talents. After publishing "The VIRTUES OF SID HAMET THE MAGICIAN'S ROD" in October 1710, Swift found this lampoon against the Whig Lord GODOLPHIN well received in many quarters. Swift had written the piece because he found Godolphin's cold reception impossible, but actually he saw a ready opportunity of injecting many of his personal annoyances with the current ministry. To be fair, Godolphin had been dismissed as lord treasurer in August and could do little for this Irish cleric, but Swift would not be satisfied and may have used this opportunity to bring himself to the attention of the Tories. Robert HARLEY, the new chancellor of the exchequer, suggested to Swift that he might solve the bishops' concerns and also have some literary assignment for this talented man.

Harley and Henry BOLINGBROKE, secretary of state, needed a political propagandist to take over the government's new paper, *The Examiner,* begun in August. Swift accepted this chance to elevate himself as well as help those of like mind concerning the future of England's foreign policy. In the first week of November 1710, Swift's first essay in the paper appeared as number 14 [number 13 above], and 33 weekly articles ran during the Tory Parliament's opening session until June 1711. Printed as a single 2,000-word essay on a folio half-sheet, its main purpose was to emphasize the virtues of Tory party policy and attack the Whigs, who maintained a lively opposition. As a disinterested but critical observer, the writer promoted an attitude of independence while attempting to mold public opinion toward Tory rule. The notion of Whig corruption, financial mismanagement, and promotion of war as a tool of foreign policy remained constant references in every essay. Pointing out the incompatibility of Whig policies with the natural instincts of most citizens allowed Swift to show how the party

had set aside critical principles associated with the Church of England and the constitution. All his critics were conspirators and his supporters remained patriots first and party members last. If the nation sought peace and economic stability, the Tories intended on restoring both, but more important, they as landed gentry naturally represented traditional, conservative values of security and order.

The nature of reform was to invest each essay, and Swift used his command of the facts on various issues and events (supplied by ministerial resources or his own research) and a deep well of moral idealism. He wrote successfully not simply because of his literary skill but more particularly because he held the moral high ground. The extended War of the Spanish Succession and the superb victories of the English Captain-General MARLBOROUGH did not answer the Whigs' continued interest in maintaining the war and keeping the country on a war footing. Swift used both reason and moral rightness as weapons against this now unjust war.

In terms of his rhetoric, Swift rejects Addison and Steele's technique of "examining" statement after statement from the Whig opposition press, which would have added to its credibility. Instead, his style stresses his personal integrity and general disdain for what he regarded as a group of hypocrites. Calmly indifferent, he avoids close analysis of his enemies' words, reserving the power of his words to suggest the faith readers should have in the Tory effort for peace. For example, in number 16 (November 23, 1710), Swift taunts his favorite subject, Marlborough, as a symbol of British ingratitude, contrasting him with Roman gratitude for one of their successful generals. Using parallel columns, he lists each gift and expenditure for a Roman versus those for Marlborough. No reader can miss the results of this budgetary statement as British gratitude amounts to a huge sum, but Swift calls it "a trifle, in comparison of what is untold." With surgical precision, his irony reveals the corruption at the heart of the Whig ministry and how essential was his exposure of these degenerate policies that misled a well-meaning people.

His additional technique of charging Marlborough with serious faults and then denying the abusive intent was a recognized rhetorical device, and protected Swift and his publisher from a lawsuit. He knew how dangerous attacking a famous and popular general could be, but he manages to turn his popularity against him. By hinting at his defects or suggesting the general's services to the nation may have been overstated, Swift begins his attack in number 16 by accusing him of avarice and personal faults, anticipating number 27 (February 8, 1711), known as the "Letter to Crassus," where a love of money seems inappropriate for a man of his stature. His public image suffers from this "little vice," as Swift calls it, and Marlborough's immunity fails under this charge of avarice.

The propaganda of the *Examiner* and Swift's talent gave him unparalleled access to power, especially from early 1711 when he shouldered an increasingly important role for public relations in the Oxford ministry, often treading lightly between Harley and Bolingbroke, whose power struggle became an obvious problem. Both ministers now were of a different mind concerning the tone and content of Swift's paper: Harley sought a milder, less vitriolic quality but Bolingbroke urged harsher methods. From number 25 (January 25, 1711), number 26 (February 1, 1711), the earlier mentioned number 27, and number 28 (February 15, 1711), Swift has clearly accepted St. John's views and sharpened his attacks. First, he poses the question: "What would have been the consequence if the late ministry [the Whigs] had continued," followed by "What may we reasonably expect they will do, if ever they come into power again?" The answer, delivered in a style that should frighten any independent Englishman, suggests the ruination of the constitution, ongoing war, further debts, and the eventual destruction of the current church. Then in number 26 he meditates on how the current Tory ministry has functioned, providing "meat for babes," not worthless cures to a dying man like the earlier government. Reviewing the virtuous character of the Tories in contrast to that "routed cabal of hated politicians," he names each of the chief Tory ministers as great men. After exposing the great Marlborough, he proceeds in number 28 to shift the blame from Marlborough to "the weakness of his advocates," and his main subject: "the conduct of the late ministry, the shameful mismanagement in Spain, or the

wrong steps in the treaty of peace." Alluding to his being too severe against the Whigs, he pretends to having received a letter supposedly written by a Tory member of Parliament urging him to write a "few good stories" on how the Whigs have violated their duties and responsibilities to the queen and people of England. "In short, turn the whole mystery of iniquity inside out, that everybody may have a view of it."

Little did Swift know that the whole project would end in a few months and that the strained relationship between Harley and Bolingbroke would become so damaged that he could not survive as author during the turmoil. Critics suggest Swift may have been glad to let go of his post, especially when it placed him between the warring camps of the two politicians he respected most. But it may also be true that he wished to remain more independent and not suffer once again from the whims of great men, as he had experienced with Sir William TEMPLE in his first visit to Moor Park. His name and talent were known in the best circles, but he hoped for some practical, career-enhancing promotion in the church: an English bishopric or deanery. Oxford would ask Swift for his continued help, even as the ministry collapsed, but the deanship would not come until nearly two years later.

FURTHER READING

Downie, J. A. *Jonathan Swift: Political Writer.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984.

———. *Robert Harley and the Press: Propaganda and Public Opinion in the Age of Swift and Defoe.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Ehrenpreis, Irvin. *Swift: The Man, His Works and the Age.* 3 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1962–83.

Ellis, Frank H., ed. *Swift vs. Mainwaring: "The Examiner" and "The Medley."* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.